Chicago, Illinois 60604 Telephone: (312) 818-6626 25 kmftranscripts@gmail.com

```
(Proceedings heard via videoconference:)
 1
 2
             THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, everyone.
 3
    This is Judge Tharp. Can everyone hear me?
 4
             MR. McCARTHY: Yes, Your Honor.
 5
             MR. MEYER: Yes, Judge.
 6
             THE COURT: All right. Are we prepared to go forward
 7
    with our sentencing hearing?
 8
             MR. McCARTHY: Yes, Your Honor. The government is
 9
    ready.
10
             THE COURT: All right. It looks we may have just
11
    lost Mr. Meyer. There we go.
12
                    This is United States v. Kentrell Brown, 19 CR
             Okay.
    900.
13
14
             Will government counsel put your appearance on the
15
    record, please.
16
             MR. McCARTHY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Shawn
    McCarthy on behalf of the United States.
17
18
             THE COURT: All right.
19
             And counsel for Mr. Brown?
20
             We seem to have lost Mr. Meyer. Mr. Meyer, can you
21
    hear me? If you can hear me, we're not seeing or hearing you,
22
    but you're still listed as a participant.
23
             Mr. Meyer, can you hear us?
24
             MR. MEYER: Yes, Judge, I can hear you.
25
             THE COURT: There you go. We lost you for about
```

1 three minutes there. 2 MR. MEYER: Sorry about that. 3 THE COURT: You want to put your appearance on the record? 4 5 MR. MEYER: Good afternoon, Judge. Geoffrey Meyer from the Federal Defender Program on behalf of Mr. Brown. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 And our probation officer, Ms. Fowlie? PROBATION OFFICER: Yes. Good afternoon, Your Honor. 9 10 Rebecca Fowlie on behalf of the probation department. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 This is a videoconference sentencing hearing, and I 13 just want to confirm before we go any further, Mr. Meyer, that 14 you have discussed the issue of proceeding by video versus 15 in-person hearing and the defendant is waiving his right to be 16 sentenced in an in-person, in-court hearing; is that correct? 17 MR. MEYER: Yes, Judge, that is correct. 18 THE COURT: All right. 19 Mr. Brown, would you raise your right hand, please. 20 Do you swear or affirm that all the statements that 21 you make in the course of this sentencing hearing will be the 22 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? 23 You may be on mute, Mr. Brown. Sorry. We can't hear 24 you. 25 THE DEFENDANT: Could you hear me now?

THE COURT: Now we can hear you. 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, it was on mute. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 All right. I want to make sure that --5 THE CLERK: Excuse me, Judge. 6 THE COURT: Yes, Alberta? 7 THE CLERK: I did not hear him say "I do." 8 THE COURT: All right. We'll do that one more time 9 since we were interrupted, Mr. Brown. Do you swear or affirm that all the statements that 10 11 you make in the course of this hearing will be the truth, the 12 whole truth, and nothing but the truth? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 14 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to ask you -- we're 15 getting a lot of feedback. I'm going to ask you to go back on 16 mute unless you are going to be speaking; all right? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 18 THE COURT: All right. I want to make sure that I 19 have reviewed everything that's been submitted for this 20 hearing. 21 In addition to reviewing the plea declaration and the 22

In addition to reviewing the plea declaration and the presentence investigation report, I have reviewed the probation office's sentencing recommendation, the government's version of the offense, the government's sentencing memorandum, the defendant's sentencing memorandum, the

23

24

25

```
1
    defendant's response to the government's memorandum and a
 2
    collection of four letters of support submitted on behalf of
 3
    Mr. Brown.
 4
             Is there any other material that was submitted that I
    have not referenced?
 5
             MR. MEYER: Not on behalf of the defense.
 6
 7
             MR. McCARTHY: Not on behalf of the government,
 8
    Your Honor.
 9
             THE COURT: All right. Is either party intending to
10
    make any evidentiary presentation today?
11
             MR. McCARTHY: Not on behalf of the government,
12
    Your Honor.
13
             THE COURT: Mr. Meyer?
14
             MR. MEYER: Not on behalf of the defense, Judge, but,
15
    Judge, if I could interrupt for just a moment. I apologize.
16
    I'm having some connection issues. With the Court's
17
    permission, I'm going to dial in by telephone and mute my
18
    video.
19
             THE COURT: All right. That's fine.
20
             MR. MEYER:
                         Thank you.
21
             This is Geoffrey Meyer. Are you able to hear me?
22
             THE COURT: We could hear you. We could also still
23
    see you.
24
             MR. MEYER: Okay. Then I believe we're ready to
25
    proceed.
```

```
THE COURT: All right. Okay. I'm sorry. Everything
 1
    that's been submitted, let's turn to the presentence
 2
 3
    investigation report.
 4
             Two aspects of that report. First, were there any
 5
    objections to the facts set forth in the PSR? I don't believe
 6
    either party identified any factual errors, but, Mr. Meyer,
 7
    any factual corrections to the PSR from the defense?
 8
             MR. MEYER: There are none from the defense, Judge.
 9
             THE COURT: All right.
10
             Mr. McCarthy?
11
             MR. McCARTHY: None on behalf of the government,
12
    Your Honor.
13
             If I may interrupt for just one moment. Do we still
14
    have the defendant? My monitor shows that he --
15
             THE COURT:
                         Thank you. I missed that.
16
             Mr. Brown, are you still with us?
17
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, I'm here.
18
             THE COURT: Could you let the correctional officer
19
    know that we don't have you on video?
20
             THE DEFENDANT: All right.
21
             THE COURT: We could see you. Can you hear us?
22
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
23
             THE COURT: Moving right ahead, there were no factual
24
    objections to the PSR. Let's turn to the calculation of the
25
    advisory sentencing guideline range.
```

Mr. Meyer, I understand the defense -- my understanding is the defense does not object to the calculation, but you have arguments that the criminal history category is effectively overstated due to the juvenile convictions. MR. MEYER: That's correct, Judge. That's our

position.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the government had no objections to the calculation of the guideline range, Mr. McCarthy?

MR. McCARTHY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So there are no objections to the accuracy of the calculation of the guideline range set forth in the presentence investigation report. I'm not going to reiterate that calculation. The bottom line of that calculation is that the final offense level is 12, criminal history category is VI. And the combination of criminal history category VI and offense level of 12 yields an advisory sentencing guideline range of 30 to 37 months, a supervised release range of one to three years and a fine range of \$5,500 to \$55,000.

Any other issues with respect to the calculation of the advisory guideline range?

MR. MEYER: Not from the defendant.

MR. McCARTHY: None from the government.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Then we'll turn to consideration of all of the factors, including the advisory sentencing guideline range that the Court is required to take into account in determining the appropriate sentence to impose in this case. I'll hear first from Mr. McCarthy on behalf of the government, then Mr. Meyer on behalf of Mr. Brown. And, Mr. Brown, once your attorney has made his arguments on your behalf, you have the right to address the Court yourself if you wish to do so. You're not required to If you choose not to do so, that will not be held against you, but you will have that opportunity once Mr. Meyer has -- or Mr. Meyer has made all his arguments; all right? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. McCarthy. THE COURT REPORTER: Judge, could we please put Mr. Brown back on mute to eliminate some of the feedback? Thank you. THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Brown, we've got you on mute again, but I'll unmute you if you need to say anything. All right. Mr. McCarthy. MR. McCARTHY: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, this defendant is a relatively young

offender. However, he is not a new offender. This defendant has a history of committing crimes. When evaluating this defendant's criminal history, at merely the age of 23, it's astonishing that he has had so many weapons offenses, a couple of which is weapons offenses, as Your Honor I'm sure viewed in the exhibits attached to the government's memorandum, this defendant simply always has a firearm. He doesn't just have a firearm. He brandishes firearms. He flashes firearms.

And in this case, Your Honor, what's most disturbing is this defendant brought his own firearm to a range. Knowing that he was a convicted felon, this defendant still felt comfortable enough, still had the audacity and the nerve to bring a gun into a firing range. He had been convicted of gun crimes before. He knew he could not have a firearm, yet he brings his own gun into the firearm [verbatim]. He uses another person to purchase ammunition.

The defendant is so brazen and so disrespectful and has such little regard for the law, he used his social media to broadcast himself, broadcast himself violating the law, broadcast him self committing felonies, and he talks about it on social media. He goes into detail on how he is going to load the gun with the ammunition and how he fires the weapon. He even describes on there what kind of gun he's using. And even more disturbing than that, Your Honor, he brings back the target after having fired the nine bullets that he said he was

going to put into the gun, he counts out what he describes as "head shots," all of this being broadcast on social media for the whole world to see, all of it for this defendant to show he has no regard for the law. This defendant has no regard for safety, no regard for rules, all this at such a young age. He knows better, Your Honor.

When you look at the videos that were submitted, the exhibits that were submitted to the government's sentencing memorandum, in the one video where the defendant is sitting in what appears to be a bedroom with many other individuals smoking some sort of substance, the defendant at various times holding two guns, pointing them at the camera, oftentimes holding one of the guns upside down.

If it weren't enough that the defendant is a convicted felon having a gun, the defendant handles the guns in a completely reckless manner. The defendant while holding these guns in this room even says, "I have court tomorrow." The defendant knows he is under the Court's eye, yet he still broadcasts to the world through social media, through Facebook Live, his utter disregard.

This defendant has been given chances, Your Honor, and each time this defendant thumbs his nose and continually breaks the law.

The defendant has criminal convictions for firearms offenses, yet he continues to possess firearms. The defendant

has not learned from prior sentences that took into consideration his young age. At this point, Your Honor, a sentence needs to grab this defendant's attention to let him know while he may be young, he is not a child. He does and should know better. And only a sentence that will express that he is no longer a child and there are real ramifications for his actions, his willful actions, his choices to disregard and violate the law will be appropriate.

Our community is plagued with gun violence. There are guns all over the streets of Chicago, all over Cook County, all over the Northern District of Illinois.

Repeatedly we see this defendant with multiple firearms, brandishing those firearms, showing those firearms off. It's only a matter of time that this defendant continues this way before one of those firearms is going to be used in a manner in which a life will be lost. A sentence needs to be imposed to get that message across not only to this defendant but to the community at large that illegal firearms are a problem. Illegal firearms will be addressed by the Court in a manner in which keeps all of us safe.

For those reasons, Your Honor, and those argued in the government's version as well as in the government's sentencing memorandum, coupled with the exhibits that were provided to Your Honor, the government would ask that Your Honor sentence this defendant to a term within the

guidelines range.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. McCARTHY: Including --

THE COURT: Go ahead. Sorry.

MR. McCARTHY: As well as supervised release of three years, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Meyer.

MR. MEYER: Thank you, Judge.

The government might see this case very differently in many respects. The government sees someone who is showing utter disregard for the law and for court orders. I see someone who is very immature.

The government sees someone who has been given chances in the past by the criminal justice system. I see someone who exemplifies many of the failures of the overworked Cook County juvenile justice system and its inability to provide support to the people who come through the system.

The government believes that a sentence imposed today needs to grab Mr. Brown's attention. And while in some respects that may be true, I think it's hard to look at a person in Mr. Brown's situation, someone who has been incarcerated over the last it's going on 14 months I believe now in a county Jail in the middle of a global pandemic and not recognize that that person has had their attention

grabbed. This sentence that he's been serving at the Kendall County Jail is not only the longest sentence that he's served in his life, it's certainly the most severe and, frankly, the most frightening.

I recognize the importance of the videos that the government provided to you, and I think they are kind of at the crux of what sentence is appropriate to impose in this case, but, again, I view them very differently than the government. You know, taking out the firearm from the video that appears to be in the bedroom, the Facebook Live stream in the bedroom, you've got a group of teenage or just barely in their twenties young men who are horsing around in many of the same ways that we expect teenagers to horse around in. You know, they're listening to music. They're singing along with the television. They're playing video games. They're engaging in horseplay amongst themselves. Now, I recognize that you can't take out the firearms in that video, that there are firearms there, and that is certainly concerning.

And I want to make clear that we're not asking in the sentence that we propose that the Court excuse Mr. Brown's conduct altogether. He recognizes that he violated the law. He recognizes that he's done wrong and he needs to be punished. What we're proposing is a punishment that we believe is more commensurate with his mindset and his maturity at the time that these offenses and his prior offenses were

committed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I looked at a lot of the electronic evidence in this case, and I have to be frank. You know, my first reaction when I see that Mr. Brown is broadcasting on Facebook Live his time at the shooting range, one, the government is correct. He knows that he's not permitted to possess a firearm. at that, and I think to myself, how could that have happened? That's so stupid, for lack of a better word. And I want to be clear, I'm not calling Mr. Brown stupid. I think the action is stupid. Mr. Brown, when I talk to him and as I've gotten to know him over the course of the last a little more than a year actually is a very intelligent person. So I think some of the struggle that I've had is reconciling what happened in these videos and the intelligent young man that I've gotten to And where I'm left is maturity and the level of maturity that Mr. Brown has shown and frankly the level of maturity we're starting to understand as we look into the science more that goes along with brain development and how, you know, even though we've chosen 18 as an age -- a cutoff age for people to transition from childhood into adulthood, that we're starting to realize that just because we've chosen that date doesn't mean that the brain develops that way.

And I think this case is actually a really powerful example of that. I think it speaks to many of the themes that the Supreme Court has returned to repeatedly when discussing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

juveniles and youth: recklessness, impulsivity, risk taking, the fact that youths are more vulnerable to negative influences and outside pressures, transient rashness, proclivity for risk, inability to assess consequences. I think those are on full display in this case and in those videos.

Now, this doesn't absolve Mr. Brown of responsibility. He recognizes that, and I recognize that. But I think it does speak to what is the appropriate sentence of imprisonment to impose on him because it goes to his mindset, and it goes to what he was doing with those firearms. He wasn't using the firearms to commit other crime, to commit violent crime. In some respects, I think they are defensive. Mr. Brown, even though he is very young, has already been the victim of gun violence, so he's well familiar that communities in the Chicagoland area are plagued by gun violence. that because he's twice been a victim. And it is not uncommon for us to see particularly younger people carry and carry openly in a defensive manner to protect from being a victim of gun violence again. It might not make sense to those of us who didn't grow up in those communities, but it is certainly something that I see in my practice again and again.

And then another aspect of this case in particular that doesn't necessarily come up in my general practice is Mr. Brown was an aspiring artist. And to be clear, I'm not

arguing that this excuses his conduct. But I think particularly the second letter that we provided to the Court in our response to the government's sentencing memo goes a long way in explaining the online persona that Mr. Brown was attempting to put forth and frankly was successfully gaining him an online social media presence. One of the videos that the government submitted to you as an Instagram Live, which I think is where the government took it, is actually a well-produced rap video of one of Mr. Brown's songs. And as he explains in his letter, this was the way he thought he had to break into the industry.

Now, he knows today that that's not the case and he can't do that going forward because he's lived the reason he can't for the last, you know, 13, 14 months. It landed him in the Kendall County Jail in the middle of a pandemic. He lost two family members while he was incarcerated and was unable to attend the funeral services, two of his older brothers that he was very close with, and that was a very, very difficult thing for him to do, or not to be able to do.

So he has had a great deal of time to think about what he needs to mature, what he needs to do in the future in order to remain out of the criminal justice system and remain with his family, which frankly has been the hardest part for him since he's been at the Kendall County Jail, is being away from his family.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I think in his two letters to the Court that we've submitted, he's shown a great deal of self-reflection and a great deal of looking forward and making plans. He started the GED classes when he could in Kendall County. He certainly intends to continue with those when he's out. And he also has been in contact with his former employer to make sure that he has a job waiting for him when he is released. And he does have a supportive family to return to.

So we believe that looking at his age, looking at his maturity level and looking at how overstated that criminal history score is in the guidelines that the original guidelines that we and the government had contemplated when he pleaded guilty are more appropriate for the Court as the starting point here. We are asking the Court to vary below those guidelines range down to 18 months and instead swap in a six-month period of home incarceration. And that particular swap is in recognition of two things: one, the pandemic; and, two, that Mr. Brown, as a young person who is still developing and still maturing, could really benefit from the far greater resources of the federal U.S. Probation Office and that six months of home incarceration with contact with a probation officer will be far more rehabilitative for him than six months in the Bureau of Prisons which is likely to remain on lockdown, you know, for the better part of the next year is everyone's best guess.

So that's how we came up with the sentence that we're proposing to the Court, and we believe, based on the circumstances of this case and for the reasons I've talked about today and the reasons we purport in our submissions to the Court, that 18 months of incarceration with six months of home incarceration to follow with a total of three years of supervised release is the appropriate sentence to impose today.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Meyer.

All right. Mr. Brown, this is your opportunity if you wish to address the Court directly. Again, you have that opportunity, but you're not required to say anything at all. If you do say anything, it will be considered by the Court in assessing the appropriate sentence to impose.

Do you wish to address the Court?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. Could you hear me?

THE COURT: Yes, I can. Thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. I just wanted to say that I just feel like being down here, I just really found better things to do and that I was immature when I was out there doing a lot of things that I shouldn't have had no business doing. And I just feel like I gained a lot from being down here.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

THE DEFENDANT: No, not really. I think I covered

everything in my letter.

THE COURT: Okay. And I did read your letter. Thank you.

Okay. Under Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 3553(a), I am required to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to promote the various objectives of sentencing that are set forth in that statute. Those purposes include the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant and to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner.

To try to arrive at a sentence that will promote those objectives, the Court must consider the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant. There are other factors the Court must take into account as well, such as the kinds of sentences available under the law, which is a category that includes consideration of the advisory sentencing guideline range. The Court is also required to consider the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants who have similar records and who have been found guilty of similar

conduct, and other factors such as restitution that are not at issue here.

Many of the facts and circumstances that bear on these considerations are overlapping in that they may be relevant to more than one objective, and sometimes the facts that are relevant point in different directions in terms of what they suggest the appropriate sentence in the case should be. It's the Court's task to take into account all of those circumstances in determining a sentence that is, again, sufficient but not necessary -- sufficient but not greater than necessary to promote the sentencing objectives.

I'm going to discuss some of the points that have been made here and the factors that bear on the Court's consideration of the appropriate sentence to impose here. I start first with the seriousness of the offense.

(Brief interruption.)

THE COURT: Excuse me. For some reason my cell phone is going off.

The charge here that Mr. Brown has been found guilty of is unlawful possession of ammunition by a previously convicted felon. In its base form, that is a serious offense for the simple reason that firearms and felons are a very volatile and dangerous combination. Firearms, of course, are lethal weapons. There's no real point here in distinguishing between ammunition and firearms. The ammunition is useless

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

without a firearm. The firearm is just about useless without the ammunition. They go hand in glove.

The reason that we don't let people who have been convicted of felonies possess firearms is because those people have demonstrated that they don't have the judgment or the capacity or the willingness to conform their conduct with the law. And the idea of putting something that -- a moment's poor judgment and inflict the kind of damage that a firearm can inflict makes any combination of felons and firearms dangerous, and that's why this crime exists.

Of course in this case there are a number of factors that make this significantly more serious than just the base level generic offense of possessing ammunition as a firearm -as a felon. While that's the charge, the clear conduct here involves more than the possession of ammunition. It involves the possession of a firearm. I share Mr. McCarthy's concern that, you know, this -- I've had other gun range felon in possession cases where the defendant went to the gun range with somebody with a FOID card and a gun was rented, was used at the range and turned in, and the defendant left. That's a situation that I have found presents, you know, less culpability than most situations where there is possession of a firearm. But that's not the situation here. Mr. Brown had his own firearm to bring to the range, bought lots of ammo at the range -- that's the basis of the offense that's been

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

charged -- and took some of that ammo with him and the firearm from the range. And there's only one real reason that you need ammunition, and that's to load a firearm. And we see in the video the kind of conduct I guess -- you can't see for sure if those many different firearms that Mr. Brown is seen in possession of on these videos, don't know if they're loaded, but they certainly got -- most of them have magazines, and many of those magazines are extended magazines. So it's a fair inference that Mr. Brown is buying ammunition, taking it from the gun range to load the firearm or firearms that he is frequently, if not constantly, as Mr. McCarthy has suggested, in possession of. And whether you think you're carrying a firearm around as a defensive mechanism or offensive, I'm sure, you know, the other side in every shootout has said we were on the defensive. We were just trying to protect ourselves. Nobody ever says, oh, yeah, we were out there to stir up trouble. We were out there to attack people without any provocation. Everybody out there in every shootout, in every gang shooting, is out there claiming to need to protect The real people that need to protect themselves themselves. are the little kids who get shot in their backyard or even get shot in their living rooms, inside their houses, on front porches because gang members are going around armed to the teeth to retaliate and protect themselves.

Mr. Brown, what you're calling protection is what's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

endangering the public today. I don't know if you were out ever driving around cruising the streets with those firearms, but I've got no reason to think they were just props in a music video. Firearms aren't free, even on the street. And I stopped trying to count the number of different firearms that you're depicted in these videos and photographs as being in possession of. And I don't know where these videos are coming But it's not coming from your work, your temporary work from. as a -- at a restaurant. So there is all kinds of aggravation here. When I see those videos, I see someone thumbing their nose at the law, showing absolute and utter disrespect, committing crimes, broadcasting those crimes to your friends and cohorts while you're on court supervision, and that is the very definition of factors in aggravation. And the sentence that is imposed in this case has to take those aggravating factors into account.

There are some factors in mitigation with respect to this offense. For whatever reason, the offense of conviction is based on your conduct at a gun range. As I've said, in the spectrum of things that people do, felons do with firearms, being at a gun range is at least a less serious form of crime in its generic sense, so I take that into some account. But for the reasons that I've already indicated, it's not really a ripe comparison to say -- to compare this with a felon who just shows up for some target practice, rents a gun, turns it

in and leaves, carrying neither a weapon nor ammunition with him.

And the biggest mitigating factor here is luck, luck that this is a nonviolent offense, luck that on some occasion when you possessed all those firearms with extended magazines that somebody didn't take offense to your message or seek to retaliate against you for something that somebody else did or just decide all that cash and those weapons was too enticing a target. I mean, there's countless things that can go wrong when you're possessing loaded firearms in the company of other young, immature males who are possessing loaded firearms. It's a recipe for disaster.

I won't continue to beat this drum too much, but as we transition into consideration of Mr. Brown's history and characteristics, of course we have to start with criminal record.

Mr. Brown, I have to say I think Mr. Meyer is right when he wrote in his sentencing memorandum he's never had a client in all his years as a criminal defense lawyer who managed to put himself in criminal history category VI without ever spending more than a year in jail. It's a dubious accomplishment, but it's an accomplishment nonetheless. And I don't think I've ever -- I know I've never seen anyone with the juvenile record that you've amassed. And it's -- if there's been one, I've forgotten. I can't recall anybody ever

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

being in criminal category VI at the ripe age of 22. So again, we have that dubious accomplishment to consider.

Mr. Meyer, I do understand your points with respect to juvenile record, and your arguments about immaturity and youthfulness certainly have the most force in the context of 15 year old and 16 year old Kentrell Brown. They've got a lot less force when we're talking about 22 year old Kentrell Brown as we are in this case. But I grant your point, and I do agree as a result that the criminal history calculation really does overstate Mr. Brown's record to some degree, and I will take that into account. As I also take into account the recidivism that's reflected there, whether it's the product of immaturity or just recalcitrance, it's still recidivism, and it still has to be considered by the Court. If this was a case, if any sentencing of a defendant was only about the defendant, the job of sentencing would be a lot simpler. don't doubt that Mr. Brown would benefit from lots of close supervision, access to services, treatment programs, mental health programs, educational programs, job skills training, all of that would absolutely be great for Mr. Brown, but it's not all about Mr. Brown. And for whatever reason Mr. Brown didn't get those things, doesn't get those things as he comes through the system, it may be unfortunate, but it's also the reality that we have to deal with. And part of what this sentence has to reflect in this case or to achieve in this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

case is to protect the public. If Mr. Brown is too immature or too abstinent or too recalcitrant or whatever the reason is that he cannot or will not comport his conduct with the law, we have to take that into account because part of what I have to do here is ensure that the sentence is sufficient to protect the public.

Mr. Brown has no high school diploma. He's got no significant job experience. He's got no significant job skills.

Mr. Brown, I don't mean that to denigrate whatever musical talents you may have. But I can tell you the vast majority of defendants who come through this court all aspire to be a rap star and it's really, really sad. It's particularly sad when I see somebody like yourself who has himself been the product of violence, gun violence, who has lost brothers to gun violence and then to hear that you're putting -- and see that you're putting out videos glorifying the culture that not only victimized you but victimized your family members who you and your lawyer tell me you care more about than anybody. And that's what's most important to you, I can't even process that because I can't imagine the reaction to losing two brothers to gun violence being to say, hey, well, I know what I'm going to do. I'm going to go and create some rap videos that glorify the culture that killed my brothers. That's what you're doing.

It's not only hard to understand. It's going to be unproductive because if you continue to glorify this culture, you're never going to make it to a recording studio. You're going to spend more and more time behind bars. The sentence imposed in this case is going to be already the longest sentence you've ever served. When you finish serving this sentence, you get out and you go back to the same ways, you touch a firearm, the next sentence is going to be even longer. That's how it works. And I don't think you have to be very mature and certainly don't have to be a rocket scientist to understand that basic premise. If you don't get with the program, the next time the message is louder.

The question of Mr. Brown's age, Mr. Meyer, really cuts both ways. I certainly acknowledge what you said about studies that show that brain development continues well into the twenties. I guess I really already made this point. The flip side of that is it creates a greater risk of recidivism among the young, and that's borne out by statistics as well. Age correlates, and usually that's presented to me as an argument why somebody who is aging out of crime, but here it's the flip side of the argument you've made saying he's too immature to be fully held accountable for his crime because that same immaturity creates greater risk of recidivism and greater risk of danger to the public, greater risk of continued criminal activity.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Considering Mr. Brown's health, there's no significant health issues that bear on the sentence to be imposed or that mitigate the offense. There is a record of substantial prior substance abuse. It's on display in some of those videos. And honestly, Mr. Brown, if we needed a public health campaign to show the dangers of mixing guns and drugs, the video of you in what I assume is your bedroom but whoever's bedroom it was with about four or five of your companions all smoking -- and Mr. McCarthy was being very cautious and conservative in saying some substance. There's no doubt that was marijuana. And at this point, under state law, marijuana use isn't a crime under certain circumstances. But there couldn't be a better illustration of the dangers of making marijuana readily available because I have to think part of -- it's not just immaturity that led you to create the It's the poor judgment that follows by getting high. And it's that poor judgment that, again, goes back to why it's so dangerous for you to possess firearms and why it's -- you know -- you know, you should be lucky -- I feel lucky and the Chicago public should feel lucky that you didn't leave that room, go out on the streets with your loaded guns while you were high and put the public at risk.

I'm going to address a couple of comments that Mr. Meyer made.

Mr. Meyer, respectfully, the characterization of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what -- the conduct on the videos as horsing around is so far from reality that I can't give it any credence. What's depicted on those videos is not Mr. Brown horsing around. It's Mr. Brown committing crimes knowingly, intentionally and purposefully, willfully, almost celebrating the fact that he's committing crimes. That's not teenage horsing around, and I cannot accept in any way, shape or form that characterization of the conduct.

Actually, looking at my notes here, I think I've addressed most of the points. The last point I wanted to address that you had made your comments about, Mr. Meyer, was that the original guideline calculation that the parties agreed to at the time of sentencing -- or excuse me -- at the time of the plea -- or not agreed to, there wasn't a plea agreement -- but contemplated I guess would be the right word is the more appropriate starting point. Just as a technical point, that's not correct. The appropriate starting point, as the Supreme Court has instructed, including in Gall, a case that your submission highlights, the appropriate starting point for all sentencing hearings is the correct and accurate calculation of the guideline range; and in that regard, the PSR reflects the accurate calculation of the guideline range. That doesn't mean, as I've already indicated, that I disagree with your basic argument about giving the same kind of weight to the juvenile convictions or adjudications than we do to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

quote-unquote adult adjudications is appropriate, but to be clear, the required starting point for the Court's analysis is the applicable advisory guideline range. And that is the starting point that I use in considering the appropriate sentence to impose.

All right. So we talked about the seriousness of the offense. The need to promote respect for the law is really part and parcel of the deterrence question, in my view. Again, this process is more complicated than speaking just to The sentence that's imposed in this case has to speak to a larger audience. It has to speak to all of Mr. Brown's friends who are flashing gang signs and flashing weapons and smoking weed and making rap videos that glorify a culture of violence and illegality. It has to speak to them. It also has to speak to all the people who are put in danger by guns and gang activity every day because it has to reinforce their confidence in the rule of law and the efficacy of the rule of law, and that's a challenge today. It seems to become more and more of a challenge every day. But that doesn't mean we abandon the challenge or we succumb to lawlessness. We don't celebrate lawlessness. We send a message, we don't tolerate this conduct. We're not going to tolerate this conduct. And that's part of what this message has to be. It has to speak to the public. Probably no individual is going to hear what sentence you got in this case

and decide, oh, I better put this gun down. That's not really the issue. The issue is confidence in the rule of law and what will happen if people lose confidence in the rule of law. And what happens when people lose confidence in the rule of law is we have chaos. So this sentence has to speak not only to you, but it has to speak to the public, and it has to help piece by piece promote respect for the law, which means promoting respect for the rule of law.

I'm required to consider the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities. The Supreme Court has -- as it has said that the sentencing guideline range should be the starting point for the Court's analysis of the factors under Section 3553(a), the Supreme Court has also instructed the best tool available for avoiding disparities among similarly situated defendants is the guideline range because imperfect though the guideline calculations may be, they're based on objective criteria, and they prescribe or recommend equivalent punishments for equivalent conduct and equivalent personal characteristics to the extent they measure them. So I have to give substantial consideration to the advisory guideline range, and I do give substantial consideration to that range.

I have to consider the kinds of sentences available under the law. This crime could be punished by probation. It will not be punished by probation. That would be grossly

inadequate to the seriousness of the offense. There's no mandatory minimum sentence that applies here. The maximum sentence that can be imposed is ten years. And, again, the advisory guideline sentence is imprisonment for a term of 30 to 37 months.

All right. I think that addresses most of the points that have been made in aggravation or mitigation by the government and by the defense, but, Mr. Meyer, are there any points in mitigation either that you neglected to discuss that you wish to add or any points that you think that I have not addressed adequately in my comments?

MR. MEYER: No, Judge. There's no additional point in mitigation that I would like to raise. I would just like to respond to one thing. I may have chosen my words inartfully before when I suggested that the lower guidelines range was the starting point. And I understand from the Court's comments that I believe the Court understood what I was trying to say, but just to clarify, we do acknowledge that 30 to 37 points is the appropriate starting point under the guidelines. I think my comments were in recognition of the Supreme Court's case law that says that the guidelines can't be presumed to be reasonable. And what I probably should have said was that we believe that the lower guidelines range is more appropriate in this case.

THE COURT: Understood. Thank you.

Mr. McCarthy, anything else from the government?

MR. McCARTHY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then I'm prepared to impose the sentence in this case.

On July 16th of 2020, defendant Kentrell Brown entered a plea of guilty to a charge of unlawful possession of ammunition in violation of Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 922(g).

I've considered all the arguments presented to me by the government, by defense counsel. I've considered Mr. Brown's statements here in court today. I've also considered the letters that were submitted, both Mr. Brown's letter and the letters submitted by family members and friends.

And, actually, before I go further, I did want to make a point to say, Mr. Brown, I read your letter, and I was impressed by your letter. Your letter, you know, if I was grading on a curve in terms of letters that defendants have submitted to me, you get an A. That letter is well-written. I mean, there's some mistakes. There was some misspellings. But it's coherent. It's logical. It's well thought out. And it tells me exactly what Mr. Meyer has told me, you're an intelligent guy. You could do so much more than this. And it's just going to be an utter waste if you continue glorifying this culture that's going to keep you behind bars

until society is satisfied and you demonstrated that you've outgrown it. What a tragedy that would be.

So I did read your letter, and I was impressed by your letter. I'm impressed by the support that your family members continue to give you here. But if they really want to support you, what they need to do is echo what I've been telling you and I bet you Mr. Meyer has been telling you as well, is you've got to turn the page.

So I've considered those letters. I've considered the federal sentencing guidelines. I've taken into consideration all the factors set forth in Section 3553(a). I've considered the totality of the circumstances in fashioning a sentence for Mr. Brown.

The government has requested a sentence within the applicable guideline range of 30 to 37 months. The defense has asked for a sentence of 18 months of incarceration to be followed with a term of supervised release of three years, the first six months of which would be held in home confinement. The probation office's recommendation is a sentence of imprisonment of 33 months, which is the middle of the guideline range.

I am imposing a sentence of 30 months which is the low end of the guideline range.

Mr. Brown, I'm sure that's more than you were hoping for. Mr. Meyer made a very cogent and thorough argument; but

for the reasons I've explained, there's more to it than just consideration of what's good and appropriate for you, and I have to take all of those objectives into account. I want you to understand that the sentence could easily have been higher, in fact, would have been higher than even the guideline range based on what I see on those videos. The reason I'm imposing a sentence within the guideline range is the very capable and effective advocacy that Mr. Meyer has provided to you and in particular in arguing about your relative youth and how the Court should take that into consideration in assessing overall your culpability and the prospects for your future and how the Court should take that into account in evaluating your past criminal history. And as I said earlier, I take that into account, and that's why I'm not imposing a sentence above the guideline range but one within the guideline range.

And for the same reasons, those same reasons contribute to why I'm imposing the sentence at the low end of that range. Along with Mr. Meyer's point that the conditions that you've been serving your sentence under -- well, not your sentence but your pretrial custody under during this pandemic have been harsher than normal, have been more punitive than normal. So I will give you some consideration in that regard as well. But this is -- as I am required to impose, this is the sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary. I can't agree a sentence less than this, for

someone with your record and someone who has thus far demonstrated such disregard for the law, I can't conclude that a lower sentence is appropriate here or will serve all of the objectives that I'm required to consider.

Mr. Brown is unlikely to have significant financial resources to pay a fine. No fine will be imposed.

Oh. The other thing I wanted to say is -- with respect to the defense request is there will be a term of supervised release of three years imposed, but the defense request of -- proposed substitution, if you will, of six months of home confinement is not persuasive to the Court. I don't find that home confinement would be terribly meaningful in light of the conduct reflected on the video and the absence of any reason to believe that Mr. Brown would be effectively supervised while being confined to his mother's home. We'll see how Mr. Brown does on supervised release. There will be a term of supervised release.

Mr. Brown, if you violate the terms and conditions of supervised release, you will be right back in front of me. And I'm going to remind you about this conversation, and I'm going to remind you and I'm going to remind Mr. Meyer what he's argued. And I'm going to ask you, why in the world are we here again? What didn't you understand about what we did on January 25, 2021? And there's going to be more custodial time if you commit more crimes. I don't want that to happen.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want you to turn the page. I don't want to see the tragedy of your life being spent behind bars. We're going to give you during the term of supervised release as much help as we can, get you some job training, get you in a treatment program, get you in a GED program if you haven't already gotten a GED by the time you get out. You would be foolish not to take advantage of every opportunity that's given to you for treatment, for training, for education. And I think -- I mean, you told me you're already trying to do that. You enrolled in a parenting class even though you don't have any kids, but you're going to have kids some day because you're going to have a life ahead of you. So that's great, and that's what you need to continue to do. And we're going to try to help you. We're not just going to try to help you. We're going to insist you do it on penalty of going back to iail. I don't want to be negative about it, but that's what That's your choice now. You either get with the it means. program or you stay behind bars. It's not more complicated than that.

Restitution is not an issue in this case.

I am required to impose a special assessment of \$100 on the count of conviction.

All right. With respect to the term of supervised release, that will be three years. It will be subject to the terms and conditions recommended in the presentence

investigation report with the exception of the two conditions that I think Mr. Meyer objected to, which was with respect to discretionary condition 16. We'll delete the at work location for probation officer's visits, and we'll delete the -- we'll change the language for "at any reasonable time" to add "as agreed in advance or as ordered by the Court."

Is that acceptable, Mr. Meyer?

MR. MEYER: Yes, Judge, it is. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. And then I will not impose the search condition, discretionary condition 23, for the reasons set forth in Mr. Meyer's memo.

I am going to impose one additional condition because I just had a case that revealed that this is actually not set forth as a condition of supervised release, and that can create some difficulties under certain circumstances.

I'm going to add as a condition that Mr. Brown appear as ordered before the Court on any occasion when he is required to be in court during the term of supervised release. That's actually not stated there anywhere, so I'm making that a term of supervised release.

All right. I think those were the only objections you had identified, Mr. Meyer. Were there any I missed or any others that you're seeking?

MR. MEYER: No, Judge. That's correct. Those were the only two objections we had.

THE COURT: Okay. The Seventh Circuit has indicated that during sentencing, defendants should be advised of their -- of each term of supervised release and the reasons that it is being imposed unless they waive that process, which they may do where the recommended terms and conditions have been made available meaningfully in advance of the sentencing hearing with an opportunity to object.

Would you like me to go through all of the terms and conditions of supervised release or does the defense waive that process?

MR. MEYER: We will waive that today, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. All of the terms and conditions of supervised release will be included in the written judgment and commitment order.

All right. Mr. Brown, you have the right to appeal the judgment in this case, including the sentence that I have imposed here today. Mr. Meyer will continue to advise you with respect to your appellate rights, but you should know that if you wish to appeal, that appeal has to be initiated by the filing of a notice of appeal in the district court for the Northern District of Illinois within 14 days of the entry of the judgment on the docket.

Mr. Meyer, the judgment will likely be entered on the docket tomorrow, so that will start the 14-day clock.

Is the defense seeking any recommendations to the

Bureau of Prisons? 1 MR. MEYER: We are, Judge, one recommendation and one 2 3 additional request. 4 As far as a recommendation for placement, just as 5 near as practicable to Chicago to facilitate family visits. 6 THE COURT: All right. 7 MR. MEYER: And the other request is to waive the 8 costs of incarceration and supervision based on an inability 9 to pay. 10 THE COURT: All right. I will recommend to the 11 Bureau of Prisons that Mr. Brown be designated to a facility 12 as close to Chicago as possible. 13 Mr. Brown, you should understand I don't have the 14 authority to tell the Bureau of Prisons where they have you 15 serve the rest of your sentence. All I can do is make a 16 recommendation, and I'm happy to make that recommendation. 17 And I will grant the request to waive the costs of 18 incarceration. 19 All right. Ms. Fowlie, anything I neglected to cover 20 from probation's perspective? 21 PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor. I believe you

covered everything.

THE COURT: Mr. McCarthy, anything else from the United States?

MR. McCARTHY: No. Your Honor.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Brown is in custody. 1 Не 2 will be remanded to the custody of the marshal and under 3 marshal's custody be transported to the designated facility. 4 If there's nothing else, I think we're adjourned. 5 Mr. Brown, I wish you good luck in the future. I 6 don't want to see you back in my courtroom because that's 7 going to mean we've got a problem, all right. So good luck to 8 you. Take advantage of the opportunities you've been given. 9 All right. We're adjourned. Thank you. 10 MR. MEYER: Thank you. 11 MR. McCARTHY: Thank you. 12 (Which were all of the proceedings heard.) 13 14 CERTIFICATE 15 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, 16 to the extent possible, of the record of proceedings in the 17 above-entitled matter given the limitations of conducting 18 proceedings via videoconference. 19 20 /s/ KELLY M. FITZGERALD April 5, 2021 KELLY M. FITZGERALD, CSR, RMR, CRR 21 Official Court Reporter 22 23 24 25